SPECIAL FEATURE
Fare Premiums by City

Since the inception of this report, there has been a broad interest in the contents of Table 2. More specifically, many readers of this report use the average yields in Table 2 as a basis against which to compare fare levels at various cities. This Special Feature expands on the use of average yields by providing fare premium data for the 80 cities listed in Table 2. A fare premium (or discount) is the measure of a market's average prices compared to the average prices in all other markets nationwide that are comparable in terms of density and distance.[1]

The purpose of this exercise is twofold. First, the service at some smaller communities may not be adequately represented by data restricted to the top 1,000 markets. If this is the case, the average yields listed in Table 2 may not be a suitable measure for comparing fare levels among cities. Attachment A examines the correlation between average yields and fare premiums at the 80 cities covered in Table 2. Second, the correlation between market power and fare levels is clearly demonstrated by fare premiums at dominated hubs, as is the moderating effect of low-fare service on fare levels. Attachment B demonstrates the influence that the presence of a low-fare carrier has on price levels by arraying the same 80 cities according to the percentage of total O&D passengers flying in markets that have low-fare competition. In Attachment C, the 80 cities are arrayed by fare premium. Ten dominated hubs appear in all three attachments and are shown in bold type.

Top 1,000 Market Average Yields and Industry-Wide Fare Premiums

The full range of service at some small- and mid-sized communities may not be adequately represented by data restricted to the top 1,000 markets. Therefore, the average yields presented in Table 2 of this report could be misleading to some degree if only a small portion of a city's overall traffic is flying in top 1,000 markets, particularly if yields are used as an instrument to rank cities against one another. To ameliorate this potential problem, we have limited Table 2 to cities that have over 100,000 passengers flying in top 1,000 markets each quarter. In order to determine if the average yield information in Table 2 provides a fair measure of comparison between markets, the 80 cities listed in Table 2 have been arrayed according to average yield, along with industry-wide fare premium data. Also listed is the average trip length and percentage of total passengers for each city that are flying in top 1,000 markets.

---

[1] The more accurate method for calculating hub fare premiums is to compare data for individual hubs to industry data for non-hub cities (that is, the industry data used in this exercise less the data for the group of dominated hubs being examined). Because dominated hub markets tend to have higher fares that methodology results in hub premiums that are higher than the premiums for dominated hub cities found in this report. However, in the interest of consistency, fare premiums for all cities in this study—from small spoke cities to large dominated hubs—have been calculated using total industry data so that comparisons may be drawn between cities.

Comparing the distribution of fare premiums and discounts calculated in this Special Feature with average yields in Table 2 discloses few aberrations. This is particularly true in the low-yield markets (the average top 1,000 yield for third quarter 1998 is 17.5 cents/mile). All but a handful of cities with yields at or below 17 cents/mile (some that do not have average trip lengths beyond 1,000 miles) have a fare discount. Similarly, the cities with yields at or above 23 cents/mile have high fare premiums as expected. The exception of Harlingen, TX is explained by the extremely short average stage-length of flights to and from that city. Dayton, OH and Jackson, MS, however, seem to be true exceptions, more likely explained by the fact that only 43 and 44 percent of total passengers in markets involving these cities, respectively, are flying in top 1,000 markets. The remaining cities with average yields falling between 18 and 22 cents/mile have reasonable fare premiums or discounts based on average yields and distances.

With only two exceptions, the average yields and distances presented in Table 2 are a reasonable representation of the fare levels at cities with significant traffic in the top 1,000 domestic city-pairs. It is important to note, however, the important role that distance plays in the use of average yields. The per-mile costs associated with flying a long-haul flight are lower than the per-mile costs for short-haul flights. Therefore it is imperative to consider stage-length when comparing two or more markets. For example, it would not be correct to assume that Harlingen, with an average yield of 23 cents/mile, has higher relative fares than Hartford, which has an average yield of only 17 cents/mile. Hartford's average stage length of 1,143 miles is over three times that of Harlingen. When compared to other markets of similar size and distance, Harlingen's fares are actually 28 percent lower than the industry average, while Hartford's are 13 percent higher.

Effects of Low-Fare Competition and Market Domination on Fare Levels

Attachment B arrays the 80 cities from Table 2 according to the percentage of total passengers flying in markets with low-fare competition. While low-fare participation in a market inarguably lowers fares, it can not always fully discipline the effects of market power. All but four markets with greater than 50 percent of passengers flying in low-fare markets have either no fare premium or a fare discount when compared to industry markets of similar size and distance. Two of the exceptions, Detroit and St. Louis, are both hubs dominated by network carriers. This suggests that in those Detroit and St. Louis markets where low-fare service is not available the hub dominant carriers charge relatively high prices. The other two, Chicago and Houston, are both large hubs for network carriers, though they were not considered dominated hubs for this study because of the strong presence of low-fare carriers in both cities at alternate airports.

Fare premiums in markets with little or no low-fare service are more varied. In some cases extenuating circumstances exist which affect fare levels. For example, Norfolk, which has a relatively low fare premium of six percent, had no low-fare service in the third quarter of 1998. Norfolk does compete with nearby Newport News, however, which receives AirTran service. Other cities, such as West Palm Beach, are destinations for

low-fare subsidiaries of network airlines. DOT data sources do not differentiate between the mainline network carriers and their low-fare subsidiaries, resulting in an underestimation of low-fare passenger levels in markets served by low-fare subsidiaries of major airlines.

Attachment C arrays the 80 cities from Table 2 in descending order by fare premium. Five of the top ten markets are dominated hubs. All of the remaining five dominated hub cities have at least 40 percent of traffic traveling in low-fare markets, yet four of the five still have positive fare premiums when compared to the rest of the industry. As indicated above, this indicates that in markets without low-fare competition fares charged by the hub dominant carriers are relatively high. The only dominated hub with a fare discount is Salt Lake City, which is also served by Southwest. The two cities with the highest fare premiums in the nation (Cincinnati- 54 percent and Charlotte- 47 percent) receive no low-fare service. Numbers three and four (Pittsburgh- 41 percent and Minneapolis- 38 percent) have only 10 percent and 21 percent of total passengers in low-fare markets, respectively. All four are dominated network hubs.

Finally, calculating overall average fare premiums for a city tends to understate the magnitude of the fare premium in many markets at that city. We know that at dominated hub cities fares tend to be relatively higher in short distance markets than in long distance markets, and at most hub cities at least some low-fare service is available. We will examine fare premiums at dominated hub cities further either in a future special feature, or a separate report.

Third Quarter 1998 Fare Premiums/Discounts
Sorted by Top 1,000+ Market Average Yields

Attachment A

City	% Passengers in Top 1,000+ Mkts	Top 1,000+ Yield	Average Distance	Fare Premium/ (Discount)	Percent Premium/ Discount	City	% Passengers in Top 1,000+ Mkts	Top 1,000+ Yield	Average Distance	Fare Premium/ (Discount)	Percent Premium/ Discount
RICHMOND, VA	50%	$ 0.35	535	$42	25%	NASHVILLE, TN	77%	$ 0.18	808	($16)	-10%
ROCHESTER, NY	53%	$ 0.32	496	$47	31%	NEW YORK, NY	95%	$ 0.18	1,161	$30	17%
CHARLOTTE, NC	**76%**	**$ 0.31**	751	**$76**	**47%**	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	62%	$ 0.18	743	($21)	-12%
GREENSBORO, NC	56%	$ 0.31	535	$18	10%	BOSTON, MA	90%	$ 0.17	1,139	$21	12%
CINCINNATI, OH	**68%**	**$ 0.28**	858	**$84**	**54%**	HARTFORD, CT	71%	$ 0.17	1,143	$24	13%
MEMPHIS, TN	**58%**	**$ 0.27**	686	**$34**	**20%**	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	78%	$ 0.17	930	($15)	-9%
PITTSBURGH, PA	**68%**	**$ 0.26**	813	**$62**	**41%**	MILWAUKEE, WI	68%	$ 0.17	1,046	$14	8%
DAYTON, OH	43%	$ 0.25	662	$4	2%	SAN ANTONIO, TX	73%	$ 0.17	807	($19)	-11%
RALEIGH/DURHAM, NC	67%	$ 0.25	734	$34	21%	COLUMBUS, OH	78%	$ 0.16	937	($10)	-6%
JACKSON, MS	44%	$ 0.24	550	($9)	-5%	KANSAS CITY, MO	86%	$ 0.16	853	($23)	-14%
MINNEAPOLIS, MN	**84%**	**$ 0.24**	968	**$65**	**38%**	OAKLAND, CA	90%	$ 0.16	576	($26)	-19%
DALLAS, TX	92%	$ 0.23	791	$33	21%	OMAHA, NE	68%	$ 0.16	894	($21)	-12%
HARLINGEN, TX	77%	$ 0.23	340	($38)	-28%	ONTARIO, CA	80%	$ 0.16	645	($25)	-17%
SYRACUSE, NY	37%	$ 0.23	682	$18	10%	SAN JOSE, CA	91%	$ 0.16	800	($12)	-8%
LITTLE ROCK, AR	44%	$ 0.22	464	($18)	-11%	SPOKANE, WA	76%	$ 0.16	511	($35)	-23%
TULSA, OK	59%	$ 0.22	575	($16)	-10%	ALBUQUERQUE, NM	78%	$ 0.15	877	($27)	-16%
ALBANY, NY	29%	$ 0.21	855	$22	12%	MANCHESTER, NH	45%	$ 0.15	562	($29)	-18%
ATLANTA, GA	**93%**	**$ 0.21**	783	**$15**	**10%**	MIAMI, FL	85%	$ 0.15	1,200	($14)	-8%
CHICAGO, IL	95%	$ 0.21	856	$21	14%	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	53%	$ 0.15	659	($51)	-31%
DENVER, CO	**87%**	**$ 0.21**	1,021	**$35**	**20%**	NEW ORLEANS, LA	80%	$ 0.15	833	($27)	-17%
LUBBOCK, TX	67%	$ 0.21	382	($38)	-28%	SACRAMENTO, CA	83%	$ 0.15	690	($25)	-17%
MIDLAND/ODESSA, TX	70%	$ 0.21	419	($36)	-26%	**SALT LAKE CITY, UT**	**87%**	**$ 0.15**	904	**($23)**	**-14%**
PHILADELPHIA, PA	83%	$ 0.21	1,025	$44	25%	SAN FRANCISCO, CA	92%	$ 0.15	1,413	$5	2%
ST. LOUIS, MO	**86%**	**$ 0.21**	769	**$18**	**12%**	TUCSON, AZ	67%	$ 0.15	791	($24)	-15%
WASHINGTON, DC	89%	$ 0.21	949	$31	19%	LONG BEACH, CA	87%	$ 0.14	916	($45)	-25%
AMARILLO, TX	73%	$ 0.20	426	($31)	-24%	PHOENIX, AZ	92%	$ 0.14	939	($23)	-14%
BUFFALO, NY	62%	$ 0.20	703	$6	4%	RENO, NV	84%	$ 0.14	636	($46)	-31%
BURBANK, CA	90%	$ 0.20	382	($21)	-20%	TAMPA, FL	85%	$ 0.14	951	($32)	-19%
HOUSTON, TX	92%	$ 0.20	818	$12	7%	BALTIMORE, MD	90%	$ 0.13	1,079	($27)	-16%
JACKSONVILLE, FL	64%	$ 0.20	654	($13)	-8%	FT. LAUDERDALE, FL	87%	$ 0.13	1,004	($39)	-23%
NORFOLK, VA	39%	$ 0.20	851	$11	6%	LOS ANGELES, CA	94%	$ 0.13	1,314	($17)	-9%
BIRMINGHAM, AL	51%	$ 0.19	682	($16)	-9%	PORTLAND, OR	84%	$ 0.13	1,039	($26)	-15%
BOISE, ID	64%	$ 0.19	449	($27)	-18%	PROVIDENCE, RI	70%	$ 0.13	981	($29)	-17%
CLEVELAND, OH	81%	$ 0.19	812	$9	6%	SAN DIEGO, CA	89%	$ 0.13	1,001	($22)	-13%
LOUISVILLE, KY	60%	$ 0.19	671	($18)	-11%	SEATTLE, WA	88%	$ 0.13	1,275	($31)	-16%
SANTA ANA, CA	85%	$ 0.19	821	$15	10%	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	70%	$ 0.13	1,052	($35)	-19%
AUSTIN, TX	73%	$ 0.18	820	$0	0%	FT. MYERS, FL	75%	$ 0.12	1,053	($46)	-25%
CO SPRINGS, CO	72%	$ 0.18	1,018	$4	2%	ORLANDO, FL	92%	$ 0.12	1,068	($45)	-26%
DETROIT, MI	**88%**	**$ 0.18**	865	**$5**	**3%**	ATLANTIC CITY, NJ	100%	$ 0.11	745	($93)	-53%
EL PASO, TX	63%	$ 0.18	594	($26)	-16%	LAS VEGAS, NV	94%	$ 0.11	986	($48)	-29%

Third Quarter 1998 Fare Premiums/Discounts
Sorted by Passengers in Low-Fare Markets

Attachment B

City	Total Markets	Total Passengers	% Psgrs in Low-Fare Markets	Fare Premium/ (Discount)	Percent Premium/ Discount	City	Total Markets	Total Passengers	% Psgrs in Low-Fare Markets	Fare Premium/ (Discount)	Percent Premium/ Discount
CHARLOTTE, NC	**89**	**1,176,830**	**0%**	**$76**	**47%**	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	79	1,348,560	57%	($15)	-9%
CINCINNATI, OH	**65**	**914,210**	**0%**	**$84**	**54%**	TUCSON, AZ	54	610,180	58%	($24)	-15%
LONG BEACH, CA	9	137,660	0%	($45)	-25%	**DETROIT, MI**	**117**	**2,986,430**	**60%**	**$5**	**3%**
NORFOLK, VA	71	581,640	0%	$11	6%	LOUISVILLE, KY	67	745,290	62%	($18)	-11%
ROCHESTER, NY	48	413,070	6%	$47	31%	**SALT LAKE CITY, UT**	**89**	**1,946,200**	**63%**	**($23)**	**-14%**
MILWAUKEE, WI	80	964,570	6%	$14	8%	OMAHA, NE	60	731,290	63%	($21)	-12%
NEW YORK, NY	174	10,452,390	7%	$30	17%	**ST. LOUIS, MO**	**104**	**2,383,900**	**66%**	**$18**	**12%**
HARTFORD, CT	82	1,076,170	8%	$24	13%	NEW ORLEANS, LA	87	1,593,680	66%	($27)	-17%
ALBANY, NY	52	380,080	8%	$22	12%	NASHVILLE, TN	95	1,458,410	68%	($16)	-10%
WEST PALM BEACH, FL	66	910,760	8%	($35)	-19%	CHICAGO, IL	171	8,639,040	69%	$21	14%
BOSTON, MA	135	4,221,800	9%	$21	12%	LAS VEGAS, NV	118	4,660,440	69%	($48)	-29%
SYRACUSE, NY	51	362,280	9%	$18	10%	AUSTIN, TX	82	1,243,160	70%	$0	0%
PITTSBURGH, PA	**95**	**1,340,020**	**10%**	**$62**	**41%**	SAN DIEGO, CA	109	3,101,330	71%	($22)	-13%
RALEIGH/DURHAM, NC	89	1,169,140	11%	$34	21%	HOUSTON, TX	125	3,781,760	72%	$12	7%
WASHINGTON, DC	151	4,187,220	13%	$31	19%	PROVIDENCE, RI	68	1,013,070	72%	($29)	-17%
PHILADELPHIA, PA	129	2,711,150	16%	$44	25%	BIRMINGHAM, AL	62	563,240	72%	($16)	-9%
BUFFALO, NY	57	634,090	18%	$6	4%	MANCHESTER, NH	52	532,230	72%	($29)	-18%
SAN FRANCISCO, CA	136	4,963,870	20%	$5	2%	BALTIMORE, MD	114	3,050,840	73%	($27)	-16%
MINNEAPOLIS, MN	**126**	**2,505,270**	**21%**	**$65**	**38%**	LITTLE ROCK, AR	58	500,510	74%	($18)	-11%
CO SPRINGS, CO	63	556,580	22%	$4	2%	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	29	239,190	74%	($51)	-31%
RICHMOND, VA	56	459,760	22%	$42	25%	KANSAS CITY, MO	98	2,143,570	74%	($23)	-14%
GREENSBORO, NC	57	519,000	24%	$18	10%	SAN ANTONIO, TX	88	1,326,960	75%	($19)	-11%
MEMPHIS, TN	**69**	**728,770**	**25%**	**$34**	**20%**	TULSA, OK	61	678,230	77%	($16)	-10%
MIAMI, FL	87	1,627,980	28%	($14)	-8%	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	68	683,650	77%	($21)	-12%
FT. MYERS, FL	55	549,380	30%	($46)	-25%	SAN JOSE, CA	69	2,287,570	78%	($12)	-8%
DAYTON, OH	53	393,570	31%	$4	2%	PHOENIX, AZ	124	3,913,820	80%	($23)	-14%
COLUMBUS, OH	79	1,316,810	37%	($10)	-6%	ALBUQUERQUE, NM	74	1,209,170	81%	($27)	-16%
DENVER, CO	**147**	**3,861,660**	**40%**	**$35**	**20%**	RENO, NV	58	1,192,230	81%	($46)	-31%
SEATTLE, WA	146	4,205,820	41%	($31)	-16%	ONTARIO, CA	68	1,388,540	81%	($25)	-17%
DALLAS, TX	163	5,776,420	43%	$33	21%	BOISE, ID	47	518,370	81%	($27)	-18%
SANTA ANA, CA	75	1,604,790	45%	$15	10%	SPOKANE, WA	45	618,420	82%	($35)	-23%
ATLANTA, GA	**154**	**5,902,600**	**47%**	**$15**	**10%**	SACRAMENTO, CA	65	1,631,250	84%	($25)	-17%
ORLANDO, FL	131	4,172,080	50%	($45)	-26%	BURBANK, CA	32	1,142,620	84%	($21)	-20%
JACKSONVILLE, FL	73	898,010	50%	($13)	-8%	EL PASO, TX	54	648,130	89%	($26)	-16%
FT. LAUDERDALE, FL	91	2,105,070	50%	($39)	-23%	OAKLAND, CA	56	2,087,850	93%	($26)	-19%
CLEVELAND, OH	95	1,825,960	50%	$9	6%	AMARILLO, TX	17	168,740	94%	($31)	-24%
TAMPA, FL	117	2,467,910	51%	($32)	-19%	LUBBOCK, TX	25	222,350	94%	($38)	-28%
LOS ANGELES, CA	152	6,990,860	52%	($17)	-9%	MIDLAND/ODESSA, TX	21	205,950	97%	($36)	-26%
PORTLAND, OR	103	2,324,890	54%	($26)	-15%	ATLANTIC CITY, NJ	8	153,530	100%	($93)	-53%
JACKSON, MS	41	230,900	57%	($9)	-5%	HARLINGEN, TX	17	179,460	100%	($38)	-28%

Third Quarter 1998 Fare Premiums/Discounts
Sorted by Average Fare Premium

Attachment C

City	Total Markets	Total Passengers	% Psgrs in Low-Fare Markets	Fare Premium/ (Discount)	Percent Premium/ Discount	City	Total Markets	Total Passengers	% Psgrs in Low-Fare Markets	Fare Premium/ (Discount)	Percent Premium/ Discount
CINCINNATI, OH	**65**	**914,210**	**0%**	**$84**	**54%**	TULSA, OK	61	678,230	77%	($16)	-10%
CHARLOTTE, NC	**89**	**1,176,830**	**0%**	**$76**	**47%**	NASHVILLE, TN	95	1,458,410	68%	($16)	-10%
PITTSBURGH, PA	**95**	**1,340,020**	**10%**	**$62**	**41%**	LOUISVILLE, KY	67	745,290	62%	($18)	-11%
MINNEAPOLIS, MN	**126**	**2,505,270**	**21%**	**$65**	**38%**	LITTLE ROCK, AR	58	500,510	74%	($18)	-11%
ROCHESTER, NY	48	413,070	6%	$47	31%	SAN ANTONIO, TX	88	1,326,960	75%	($19)	-11%
PHILADELPHIA, PA	129	2,711,150	16%	$44	25%	OMAHA, NE	60	731,290	63%	($21)	-12%
RICHMOND, VA	56	459,760	22%	$42	25%	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	68	683,650	77%	($21)	-12%
DALLAS, TX	163	5,776,420	43%	$33	21%	SAN DIEGO, CA	109	3,101,330	71%	($22)	-13%
RALEIGH/DURHAM, NC	89	1,169,140	11%	$34	21%	**SALT LAKE CITY, UT**	**89**	**1,946,200**	**63%**	**($23)**	**-14%**
MEMPHIS, TN	**69**	**728,770**	**25%**	**$34**	**20%**	KANSAS CITY, MO	98	2,143,570	74%	($23)	-14%
DENVER, CO	**147**	**3,861,660**	**40%**	**$35**	**20%**	PHOENIX, AZ	124	3,913,820	80%	($23)	-14%
WASHINGTON, DC	151	4,187,220	13%	$31	19%	PORTLAND, OR	103	2,324,890	54%	($26)	-15%
NEW YORK, NY	174	10,452,390	7%	$30	17%	TUCSON, AZ	54	610,180	58%	($24)	-15%
CHICAGO, IL	171	8,639,040	69%	$21	14%	SEATTLE, WA	146	4,205,820	41%	($31)	-16%
HARTFORD, CT	82	1,076,170	8%	$24	13%	BALTIMORE, MD	114	3,050,840	73%	($27)	-16%
ST. LOUIS, MO	**104**	**2,383,900**	**66%**	**$18**	**12%**	ALBUQUERQUE, NM	74	1,209,170	81%	($27)	-16%
ALBANY, NY	52	380,080	8%	$22	12%	EL PASO, TX	54	648,130	89%	($26)	-16%
BOSTON, MA	135	4,221,800	9%	$21	12%	PROVIDENCE, RI	68	1,013,070	72%	($29)	-17%
GREENSBORO, NC	57	519,000	24%	$18	10%	NEW ORLEANS, LA	87	1,593,680	66%	($27)	-17%
SYRACUSE, NY	51	362,280	9%	$18	10%	SACRAMENTO, CA	65	1,631,250	84%	($25)	-17%
ATLANTA, GA	**154**	**5,902,600**	**47%**	**$15**	**10%**	ONTARIO, CA	68	1,388,540	81%	($25)	-17%
SANTA ANA, CA	75	1,604,790	45%	$15	10%	MANCHESTER, NH	52	532,230	72%	($29)	-18%
MILWAUKEE, WI	80	964,570	6%	$14	8%	BOISE, ID	47	518,370	81%	($27)	-18%
HOUSTON, TX	125	3,781,760	72%	$12	7%	TAMPA, FL	117	2,467,910	51%	($32)	-19%
NORFOLK, VA	71	581,640	0%	$11	6%	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	66	910,760	8%	($35)	-19%
CLEVELAND, OH	95	1,825,960	50%	$9	6%	OAKLAND, CA	56	2,087,850	93%	($26)	-19%
BUFFALO, NY	57	634,090	18%	$6	4%	BURBANK, CA	32	1,142,620	84%	($21)	-20%
DETROIT, MI	**117**	**2,986,430**	**60%**	**$5**	**3%**	FT. LAUDERDALE, FL	91	2,105,070	50%	($39)	-23%
SAN FRANCISCO, CA	136	4,963,870	20%	$5	2%	SPOKANE, WA	45	618,420	82%	($35)	-23%
CO SPRINGS, CO	63	556,580	22%	$4	2%	AMARILLO, TX	17	168,740	94%	($31)	-24%
DAYTON, OH	53	393,570	31%	$4	2%	LONG BEACH, CA	9	137,660	0%	($45)	-25%
AUSTIN, TX	82	1,243,160	70%	$0	0%	FT. MYERS, FL	55	549,380	30%	($46)	-25%
JACKSON, MS	41	230,900	57%	($9)	-5%	ORLANDO, FL	131	4,172,080	50%	($45)	-26%
COLUMBUS, OH	79	1,316,810	37%	($10)	-6%	MIDLAND/ODESSA, TX	21	205,950	97%	($36)	-26%
MIAMI, FL	87	1,627,980	28%	($14)	-8%	LUBBOCK, TX	25	222,350	94%	($38)	-28%
JACKSONVILLE, FL	73	898,010	50%	($13)	-8%	HARLINGEN, TX	17	179,460	100%	($38)	-28%
SAN JOSE, CA	69	2,287,570	78%	($12)	-8%	LAS VEGAS, NV	118	4,660,440	69%	($48)	-29%
LOS ANGELES, CA	152	6,990,860	52%	($17)	-9%	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	29	239,190	74%	($51)	-31%
INDIANAPOLIS, IN	79	1,348,560	57%	($15)	-9%	RENO, NV	58	1,192,230	81%	($46)	-31%
BIRMINGHAM, AL	62	563,240	72%	($16)	-9%	ATLANTIC CITY, NJ	8	153,530	100%	($93)	-53%